

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-70, 72, and 75-88 are all the claims pending in the application. Some of the dependencies of the claims contained various informalities, which this amendment corrects.

The Examiner rejected claims 80-82 and 88 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Terasawa in view of Hoen. In making this rejection, the Examiner acknowledged that Terasawa does not meet the requirement for the claimed valve, but relied on Hoen for this teaching. The Hoen valve shown in Fig. 4 bears a few similarities to the valve of claim 80, but Hoen teaches a normally closed valve, and teaches that the actuation body deforms the diaphragm to open the exit port (whereas the claim requires that the deforming of the diaphragm close the exit port). The Terasawa reference provides for its own valve 52 which, as shown in Fig. 1, is normally open so that ink can flow freely. The Hoen valve would not be a good replacement for the Terasawa valve because it is a normally closed valve and would ruin the functionality of the Terasawa device. Moreover, there is no reason to change the Terasawa valve with the Hoen valve; the art teaches no deficiency in the Terasawa valve that would have encouraged the artisan of ordinary skill to have made the suggested modification. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that the person of ordinary skill would not have, and could not have combined the two references in the manner thought by the examiner to be obvious. Finally, the outlet of the valve control chamber of Hoen does not communicate with the inside of the ink storage unit (see figure 32). Applicant therefore respectfully requests the examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 80 and its dependent claims 81, 82, and 88.

The Examiner rejected claim 83 (83/81/80) as being unpatentable over Terasawa in view of Hoen, and further in view of Burr. Since Burr does not compensate for the above identified deficiencies of the Terasawa / Hoen combination vis-à-vis claim 80, even the combined teachings of Terasawa, Hoen, and Burr cannot be said to render the subject matter of claim 80 unpatentable, much less its dependent claim 83. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner also to withdraw this rejection.

Applicant is grateful for the indication of the allowability of some of the claims, but notes with interest the examiner's reasons for allowance. Specifically, applicant appreciates the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
U.S. APPLICATION NO. 09/545,834  
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q58793


examiner's explanation of his primary motivation for allowing the claims, but applicant does not acquiesce in any implication that the examiner's primary reason for allowing a given claim is an indication of only a single patentably distinct feature in the claim. To the contrary, the claims should be read as a whole, and it should be appreciated that the claims may include many patentably distinguishing features, including the combinations of features.

Applicant is glad that the examiner has indicated the allowability of claims 84-87 upon rewriting in independent form, but Applicant invites the examiner to allow these claims in their present form in view of the points presented above.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kelly G. Hyndman  
Registration No. 39,234

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 15, 2003